

P16793

PATENT

REMARKS

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 19 2007

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application and Claims 1-28 stand rejected. No claims are amended in this response. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of pending Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26 and 28 in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, para. 1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Action asserts that the limitation in each of these claims relating to a "notification including a signal from the cell phone" is not clearly described in the specification. However, in paragraph 17 of the specification, is the following:

In 401, a cell phone receives a call. In 402, the cell phone is examined to determine if it is coupled to a PC. If the cell phone is not coupled to the PC, then the cell phone will behave as it typically does, i.e., the user may either pick up the call or allow his voice mail to pick up. *If, however, the cell phone is coupled to the PC, then in 403, the PC receives notification that there is an incoming call on the cell phone.*

(Emphasis added).

The above referenced paragraph clearly supports the limitation cited by the Action and therefore the rejections of claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 are under 35 U.S.C. §112 cannot stand and should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21-23, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Simpson ("Simpson" U.S. Publication No. 2004/0266399) in view of French-St. George et al. ("George" U.S. Patent No. 6,122,348). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Applicants continue to disagree with the Examiner's position that the combination of Simpson and George renders the pending claims unpatentable. In the Response to Applicant's arguments, the Action asserts that Simpson and George teach "retrieving

Best Available Copy

P16793

PATENT

information in addition to the caller ID associated with the incoming call." However, at paragraph 0011 of the specification, is the following:

Application 110 may also retrieve the caller's name from a variety of other sources. For example, if Entity A's name is not entered in Cell Phone 105's local phone book, Application 110 may retrieve the information from a phone book or address book stored on PC 100. Alternatively, Application 110 may retrieve the information from a remote source coupled to PC 100. In yet another embodiment, the information may be transmitted with the call as caller ID information.

Application 110 may also be configured to retrieve a variety of other information associated with the call, if the information is available.

Therefore, the claim element relating to "retrieving information in addition to the caller ID associated with the incoming call" is supported by the specification.

Applicant therefore continues to assert that Simpson does not teach or suggest the claimed element of "retrieving information in addition to a caller ID associated with the incoming call". Instead, Simpson merely describes retrieval of a caller ID and no other information. Additionally, Applicants respectfully continue to assert that George does not overcome the shortcomings of Simpson because George also does not disclose retrieving information in addition to a caller id associated with an incoming call or a system wherein a cell phone is coupled to a personal data processing device where the personal data processing device is capable of receiving a signal from the cell phone to notify the data processing device of incoming calls. George clearly does not describe the claimed element of "receiving notification of the incoming call on a personal data processing device external to the cell phone, the notification including a signal from the cell phone", as claimed.

Applicants thus respectfully submit that the combination of Simpson and George does not teach or suggest all the elements of the independent claims. More specifically, as previously discussed, Simpson does not teach various elements of the independent claims and the combination of George with Simpson does not overcome this problem. Since the dependent claims incorporate all the limitations of the independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Simpson and George also does not render the dependent claims unpatentable. Applicants therefore respectfully request the

P16793

PATENT

Examiner to withdraw the rejection to Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Best Available Copy

MAR 19 2007

P16793

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that pending Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26 and 28 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this case. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (714) 669-1261.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 19, 2007

/Sanjay S. Gadkari/
Sanjay S. Gadkari
Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 55,796
(503)264-4348

Best Available Copy